

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 1 and 2 of the Office Action

The specification and abstract have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The specification and abstract have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nitz [US 4,901,209] in view of Hsu et al. [US 4,871,042].

Claim 7 has been cancelled.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "an illumination system comprising: a plurality of light emitting members mounted in said frame and each comprising a fiber optic cable" and "wherein the interior surface of said peripheral walls of at least one of said tubes having at least one fiber optic cable receiving corridor formed therein and extending in a longitudinal direction of said at least one tube, said at least one fiber optic receiving corridor having one of said fiber optic cables positioned therein". The corridors of the applicant's claimed invention receive the fiber optic cables, and thereby mount the cable to the wall of the tube, thus restricting movement of the cables in the interior of the tubes and any rattling of the cables against the tube wall, which in the least can be annoying and at worst can damage the fiber optic cables.

The Nitz reference teaches optical fibers that are freely movable in the interior of the tube, unless a sufficient number of cables are lodged in the interior to prevent the movement of the cables about the interior. The bundle of fibers in the Nitz teaching are therefore free to move about the interior, and may rattle. It is submitted that the applicant's claimed invention permits the use of fewer fiber optic cables to illuminate the frame, and produces a neater presentation of the cables in the translucent frame as the cables are not able to undulate through the interior space of the tubes.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 6 is therefore respectfully requested.